

REMARKS

Claims 84-119 remain in the present application. Claims 2-3, 6-8, 10-11, 14-18 and 22-83 are cancelled herein. Claims 84-119 are added herein.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim additions. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 22-23, 26-34, 36-37, 51-54, 57-65, 67-68 and 82-83

Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 22-23, 26-34, 36-37, 51-54, 57-65, 67-68 and 82-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,468,157 to Hinami et al. (hereafter referred to as “Hinami”). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 22-23, 26-34, 36-37, 51-54, 57-65, 67-68 and 82-83 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hinami for the following reasons.

Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 22-23, 26-34, 36-37, 51-54, 57-65, 67-68 and 82-83 are cancelled herein. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection applied to Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 22-23, 26-34, 36-37, 51-54, 57-65, 67-68 and 82-83 is moot at this time.

New Claims 84-119

New independent Claims 84, 96 and 108 contain similar limitations to cancelled independent Claims 22 and 53. As such, new independent Claims 84,

96 and 108 will be argued herein in light of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections applied to cancelled independent Claims 22 and 53.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 84 that recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

a multi-layer display comprising:
 a first display screen; and
 a second display screen overlapping said first display
screen; and
 a user interface component for designating at least one of said first
and second display screens as an active display screen for responding to
an input.

Independent Claims 96 and 108 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 84. Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hinami fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “a first display screen” and “a second display screen” as recited in independent Claim 84. As recited and described in the present application, a multi-layer display comprises a first display screen and a second display screen.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Hinami to teach a *single* display screen (Figures 1-2). Further, Hinami teaches that objects are displayed “*on one screen*” (col. 7, lines 34-35). Accordingly, Hinami teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching objects displayed on a *single* screen instead of a *first and second* display screen as claimed.

Although page 3 of the rejection suggests that the ground and sky planes of Hinami’s Figure 3 teach or suggest display screens as claimed, Applicants respectfully submit that the planes as taught by Hinami are very different from

display screens as claimed. Hinami teaches that these planes are *virtual* planes for arranging objects (line 65 of col. 6 through line 33 of column 7). Further, as discussed above, Hinami teaches that these objects are displayed on *a single screen*. As such, Applicants again submit that that Hinami teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 84 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hinami. Since independent Claims 96 and 108 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 84, independent Claims 96 and 108 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hinami. Since dependent Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hinami.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 11, 17-18, 24-25, 35, 38-50, 55-56, 66 and 69-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinami. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 11, 17-18, 24-25, 35, 38-50, 55-56, 66 and 69-81 are not rendered obvious by Hinami for the following reasons.

Claims 3, 11, 17-18, 24-25, 35, 38-50, 55-56, 66 and 69-81 are cancelled herein. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection applied to Claims 3, 11, 17-18, 24-25, 35, 38-50, 55-56, 66 and 69-81 is moot at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 84-119 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Please direct all future correspondence to the below address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 2/26, 2007

Bmf

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060